



USPTO
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

27 October 2009

Re: Request for Continuing Examination for application 10/566,482

Dear Sir,

In response to the Notice of Allowance dated 08/11/2009 and following your recommendations given in the phone interview held on 9/22/2009, please find enclosed a Request for Continuing Examination and proposed amendments to the claims and specification.

Comments:

After receipt of the Notice to Allowance it has come to my attention that an error/discrepancy has occurred in the specification, which was subsequently transferred into Claim 1 as per Notice of Allowance.

The main purpose of this Request of Continuing Examination is, therefore, to correct the above discrepancy.

The discrepancy that is present in the current specification is between the generally accepted definition of microcavity [H. Yokoyama " Physics and device applications of optical microcavities" Science, Vol. 256, April 1992, pp. 66-70] as having dimension in the order of single wavelength and the paragraph 0023 of the specification where it is stated that the dimension of microcavity is in the order of half wavelength. The latter is inaccurate.

The microcavity as having half wavelength dimension, that is currently present in paragraph 0023 of the specification, represents one specific example described in the above reference and not the generally accepted definition of microcavity. The latter can be found in the first sentence of the abstract of this reference i.e. *Optical microcavities are resonators that have at least one dimension on the order of a single optical wavelength.*

Whereas half-wavelength dimension can be advantageous as it requires less material for construction of microcavity, it does not represent, however, the correct range of the microcavity dimensions, but rather their lower limit.